



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/044,915	01/15/2002	Peter K. Lyons	23452-150	5007

29315 7590 11/02/2005

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILLS ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

BULLOCK JR, LEWIS ALEXANDER

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2195

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/044,915

Applicant(s)

LYONS, PETER K.

Examiner

Lewis A. Bullock, Jr.

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 8/4/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 August 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10-12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by SAKANISHI (U.S. Patent 6,678,888).

As to claim 1, SAKANISHI teaches a system for enabling updates (automatic software updates) on a running application server (intermediate control system), the system comprising: an application server (intermediate control system) that hosts one or more applications (software) used by one or more clients (controlled system); a deployer (upper control system) that coordinates an update to the one or more applications (software) on the application server (intermediate control system), the deployer further comprising: a configuration file (software information file) that assigns a priority (priority level) to the update and coordinates the update to the one or more applications (software) on the application server (intermediate control system) based, at least in part, upon the assigned priority (priority level) (via using the file to generate a table that compares the updates version/priority level of the software to the current executing version/priority level to see if the software should be downloaded) (col. 7,

Art Unit: 2195

lines 13-19; col. 5, lines 19-62; col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 10; col. 8, line 6-28; col. 8, lines 43-61). It is inherent to the teachings of SAKANISHI that since the updates are performed automatically as disclosed by the system or the defined steps that the update is performed without restarting the a server.

As to claim 3, SAKANISHI teaches a method for updating an application (automatic software update) on an application server (intermediate control system), wherein the application is used by one or more client devices (controlled systems), the method comprising: determining that an update is available for the application on the application server (via an upper control system determining that software needs to be updated / determines a new software exists); signaling the application server that the update is available (via communicating an indication of a new piece of software / or sending the software information file); determining a priority level (version / priority level) associated with the update; deciding whether to proceed with the update based, at least in part on the priority for the update (via comparing the versions of the software), and if the decision is to proceed; adjusting the application so that the update may proceed (via determining affected dependent software based upon the update and packaging those components also or use a different version of the software update); updating the application and signaling the application server (via applying the update by using the file to generate a table that compares the updates version/priority level of the software to the current executing version/priority level to see if the software should be downloaded) (col. 7, lines 13-19; col. 5, lines 19-62; col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 10; col. 8, line 6-28;

col. 8, lines 43-61). It is inherent to the teachings of SAKANISHI that since the updates are performed automatically as disclosed by the system or the defined steps that the update is performed without restarting the a server.

As to claim 4, SAKANISHI teaches the step of determining a priority comprises: reading the priority (priority level) assigned to the update by the deployer (upper control system) (via generating a table that indicates / compares the updates version/priority level of the software to the current executing version/priority level to see if the software should be downloaded) (col. 7, lines 13-19; col. 5, lines 19-62; col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 10; col. 8, line 6-28; col. 8, lines 43-61), wherein the assigned priority is based, at least in part, upon a predetermined configuration (col. 6, line 10-27).

As to claim 5, SAKANISHI teaches the deployer (upper control system) that coordinates an update to an application (software update) running on an application server (intermediate control system) wherein the application is used by one or more clients (controlled systems), the deployer comprising: a configuration file (software information file) that assigns a priority (version / priority level) to the update and pushes the update to the application server based, at least in part, upon the assigned priority (via using the file to generate a table that compares the updates version/priority level of the software to the current executing version/priority level to see if the software should be downloaded) (col. 7, lines 13-19; col. 5, lines 19-62; col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 10; col. 8, line 6-28; col. 8, lines 43-61).

As to claim 7, SAKANISHI teaches a signaler to signal the application server when the update is complete (via applying the update by using the file to generate a table that compares the updates version/priority level of the software to the current executing version/priority level to see if the software should be downloaded) (col. 7, lines 13-19; col. 5, lines 19-62; col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 10; col. 8, line 6-28; col. 8, lines 43-61).

As to claim 8, refer to claim 1 for rejection.

As to claims 10 and 11, reference is made to a processor readable medium that corresponds to the method of claims 3 and 4 and is therefore met by the rejection of claims 3 and 4 above.

As to claims 12 and 14, refer to claims 5 and 7 for rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 6, 9, 13, 15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAKANISHI (U.S. Patent 6,678,888) in view of O'NEILL (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0215755).

As to claims 2 and 15, SAKANISHI substantially discloses the invention above. However, SAKANSHI does not teach using a duplication storage space first. O'NEILL teaches a multi-tier software updating system that uses a duplicate application storage space (memory of update generator device / storage components of the update server array / update device servers) that communicates with the deployer (update generator), wherein the update to the one or more applications (software updates) is first performed on the duplicate application storage space (via the update generator compares the versions of the software first in order to create an instruction set for transmitting to the update array / update servers memory that substantially reduces the update package wherein the update array / servers memory acts as gateways which transfer the update packages to clients) (pg. 4, para. 0043 – pg. 5, para. 0047; pg. 6, para 0059 – pg. 7, para 0061). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of SAKANISHI with the teachings of O'NEILL in order to facilitate a system that generates and distributes updates that are of reduced size to allow for more rapid acquisition (pg. 2, para. 0011-0012).

As to claim 9, refer to claim 2 for rejection.

As to claim 17, SAKANISHI substantially discloses the invention above.

However, SAKANISHI does not teach the cited polling functionality. O'NEILL teaches a multi-tier software updating system wherein the determining that an update is available comprises: polling a storage location (memory) to check for the presence of an update (via the update generator being alternatively equipped with the ability to generate and provide a plurality of update packages prior to receiving the identity information, by retrieving from memory or storage an archived version of the desired update package / the update component scheduled to operate automatically, polling the server manifest and identifying a difference between the existing version of the file and the latest version available on the update device server) (pg. 4, para. 0042; pg. 8, para. 0069). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of SAKANISHI with the teachings of O'NEILL in order to facilitate a system that generates and distributes updates that are of reduced size to allow for more rapid acquisition (pg. 2, para. 0011-0012).

As to claim 6, SAKANISHI substantially discloses the invention. However, SAKANISHI does not teach the poller. O'NEILL teaches a multi-tier software updating system having a poller to poll a storage location (memory) and determine whether modified application files exists (via the update generator being alternatively equipped with the ability to generate and provide a plurality of update packages prior to receiving the identity information, by retrieving from memory or storage an archived version of the desired update package / the update component scheduled to operate automatically,

polling the server manifest and identifying a difference between the existing version of the file and the latest version available on the update device server) (pg. 4, para. 0042; pg. 8, para. 0069). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of SAKANISHI with the teachings of O'NEILL in order to facilitate a system that generates and distributes updates that are of reduced size to allow for more rapid acquisition (pg. 2, para. 0011-0012).

As to claim 13, refer to claim 6 for rejection.

5. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAKANISHI (U.S. Patent 6,678,888).

As to claim 16, SAKANISHI teaches applications having priority levels (col. 7, lines 13-19; col. 5, lines 19-62; col. 5, line 63 – col. 6, line 10; col. 8, line 6-28; col. 8, lines 43-61). However, SAKANISHI does not teach how priorities are based. Official Notice is taken in that it is well known in the art that priorities can be based on the type of software, i.e. user applications, system programs, etc., and therefore would be obvious in view of SAKANSISHI that the type of application would contribute to its priority and how its updates are performed.

6. Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over SAKANISHI (U.S. Patent 6,678,888) in view of FLETCHER (U.S. Patent 6,009,274).

As to claims 18-21, SAKANISHI substantially discloses the invention above. However, SAKANISHI does not teach the client device handling of the update. FLETCHER teaches client devices (end systems) handling of application updates (software) have a priority wherein some components are in used by either halting the application, prevented access by not currently using client devices and halted when current client devices stop using the application, or halting the application when no client is using the application (via updating the operating system registry information to point to the new file components such that the next time the operating system is rebooted the modified registry information is used by the operating system while updates to other components are made immediately) (col. 12, line 64 – col. 13, line 25). Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of SAKANISHI with the teachings of FLETCHER in order to facilitate “on the fly” use of two directory paths for those components that cannot be dynamically updated (col. 5, lines 44-52).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lewis A. Bullock, Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3759. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 8:30 - 5:00.

Art Unit: 2195

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571) 272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

October 31, 2005


LEWIS A. BULLOCK, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER